24 Oct 84

14.261

REPORT TO PLANNING COMMITTEE

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

SUMMARY

On 16 and 23 Oct 84 Planning Committee received approximately 50 briefs on the first stage of a two stage process to review the Official Plan. Based on the work to date and what was received and heard the following is recommended:

1. The Regional Development Strategy be on the basis that Ottawa-Carleton could grow to between 625,000 and 725,000 persons by the turn of this century, with the expectation of additional growth beyond 2001 and that infrastructure be provided incrementally dependent upon the actual amount of growth which materializes through the planning period.

2. The Regional Development Strategy be on the basis that the number of additional housing units required to 2001 will be in the range of 65,000 to 100,000 units, that a mixture of low, medium, and high density housing forms will be provided, and that a variety of housing types both inside and outside the Greenbelt will best accommodate the housing requirements of this century.

3. The Regional Development Strategy be based on policies which ensure sufficient growth potential, within the Region including the designation of sufficient urban lands, as required, to meet the high growth projection to 2001.

4. The Regional Development Strategy be on the basis of complete development inside the greenbelt and three urban communities of approximately equal size, east, west and south outside the greenbelt; the future location, configuration and timing of urban lands additional to those now designated as Phase 1 lands outside the greenbelt to be the subject of a further study.

5. The Regional Development Strategy be based in general on achieving, or surpassing, the modal split guidelines contained in the 1974 Regional Plan.

6. The Regional Development Strategy be based on shifting the emphasis of employment growth away from the Central Area to other employment centres - with special emphasis on selected nodes along the transitway and the urban communities outside the Greenbelt.

7. Decisions on the Regional Development Strategy not be held in abeyance pending a review of the necessity or timing of individual infrastructure elements, but that these be reviewed in detail in the second stage of the official plan review.

8. Staff recommend that recommendation 8 be withdrawn.

9. The Regional Development Strategy be based on the continued protection of agricultural, mineral and environmental resources and that the preparation of rural development policies during the second stage of the official plan review, recognize the primary importance of these resources.

10. The Regional Development Strategy be based on the recognition that serviced villages in close proximity to the urban area are a Regional concern and that these communities be subject to the urban development policies of the Regional Plan.

11. The Regional Development Strategy be based on the principle that the amount of growth in the rural areas of the region be planned to occur in relation to overall growth in the Region.

PROCESS

12. The process outlined on P. 12 be confirmed which would result in a draft official plan for discussion (excluding the transportation chapter) being available in May 1985.

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

13. The staff as part of Stage 2 of the Official Plan Review investigate the desirability and feasibility of a) increased growth inside the greenbelt as contemplated by the City of Ottawa and b) increasing the size of the East Urban Community as contemplated by the Township of Cumberland.

14. In order that 13a) can be carried out the City of Ottawa be requested to confirm the Regional staff's allocation of 34,000 dwelling units or to recommend an alternate allocation consistant with their brief, by the end of December 1984.

BACKGROUND

On 26 Jun 84 Planning Committee received eleven recommendations (see Annex A) from staff regarding the Regional Development Strategy (being the first of two stages of the Regional Official Plan Review). The eleven recommendations were based on a discussion paper published in March 1984 and the comments and briefs received from the public, agencies and area municipalities in response to that discussion paper (public hearing held 29 May 84).

Subsequent to the release of the 26 Jun 84 report, the staff met informally with various community groups over the summer to discuss the eleven recommendations and supporting background material. On the 16 Oct 84 Planning Committee held a public hearing to receive formal comments and briefs on the staff report. Approximately fifty briefs were received. On 23 Oct 84, Planning Committee continued the hearing to provide additional time to explore issues with the authors of certain briefs and to hear representations by regional councillors.

The purpose of this report is to summarise the comments raised in the briefs and at the hearing, and to recommend changes to the eleven recommendations where staff feel such changes can be supported. It should be noted that this report does not attempt to re-argue the case for the eleven recommendations - such arguments were presented in the June report (see Annex A). Rather, this report highlights what staff believe to be the main points arising from the briefs and the hearing, and presents argument where modifications to the original eleven recommendations are proposed.

This report therefore does not represent a thorough point-by-point review of all of the briefs and comments put forward at the public hearing - rather it attempts to weigh the degree of support given to each of the eleven recommendations so that members of Planning Committee might be assisted in reaching their conclusions on this aspect of the Official Plan Review.

DISCUSSION

Recommendation 1

> The Regional Development Strategy be on the basis that Ottawa-Carleton could grow to between 625,000 and 725,000 persons by the turn of this century and that infrastructure be provided incrementally dependent upon the actual amount of growth which materializes through the planning period.

There were several specific views raised in the briefs in response to this recommendation including some notes of skepticism about RMOC's real growth potential, a concern that the development of infrastructure should be explicitly tied to population threshholds in the Plan, and a suggestion that additional growth should be directed to rural areas outside the Region, with a resultant reduction in the Region's potential growth. However, on balance, there was fair support for the range as reasonable for regional planning purposes to 2001 and that infrastructure should be provided as growth materialized.

However the undue emphasis placed on the year 2001 (namely 16 years away) detracts from the long term nature of the official plan (25-40 years) staff are therefore recommending a small change as follows:

> **The Regional Development Strategy be on the basis that Ottawa-Carleton could grow to between 625,000 and 725,000 persons by the turn of this century, with the expectation of additional growth beyond 2001 and that infrastructure be provided incrementally dependent upon the actual amount of growth which materializes through the planning period.**

Recommendation 2

> The Regional Development Strategy be prepared on the basis that the majority of new households to 2001 will require low and medium density ground-oriented housing, the bulk of which will be accommodated on lands outside the Greenbelt.

The forecast of additional households which acompanies the population range of 625,000 to 725,000 is approximately 65,000 to 100,000 new households by 2001. This forecast (in global terms) was not challenged. However, the presumption that a

majority of new households would require low and medium density ground-oriented housing (and the corollary that the bulk of these would need to be accommodated on lands outside the Greenbelt) received a mixed reaction. Although there was no fundamental challenge to the concept of additional growth in the urban communities outside the Greenbelt the opinion was voiced that there is substantial potential inside the Greenbelt to provide housing units (in terms of land and unused infrastructure capacity) and this potential should not be overlooked. There was also the opinion advanced that many of the new households to 2001 may in fact prefer housing forms other than low to medium ground-oriented housing.

The City of Ottawa in their brief advanced an alternative wording for this recommendation to reflect the desirability of achieving a mixture of housing types and locations.

The staff concur in large part with the City of Ottawa's suggested rewording but wish to add the actual forecast numbers so that these might be confirmed as follows:

> **The Regional Development Strategy be on the basis that the number of additional housing units required to 2001 will be in the range of 65,000 to 100,000 units, that a mixture of low, medium, and high density housing forms will be provided, and that a variety of housing types both inside and outside the Greenbelt will best accommodate the housing requirements of this century.**

Recommendation 3

> The Regional Development Strategy be based on the designation of sufficient additional urban lands to meet the high growth projection to 2001.

While there appears to be agreement with a strategy that will provide sufficient growth potential to meet the perceived needs for growth under the high projection to 2001, there is no general agreement on the amount of land needed to be designated now. There is some support for additional studies of this matter and consideration of a "triggering mechanism", tied to a monitoring process, which would bring on more lands if/when such lands are needed. This more cautious position is apparently founded on the view that lands inside the Greenbelt, principally in the City of Ottawa, will absorb sufficient growth to obviate the need for designating and servicing additional residential lands (i.e. through the building-up of vacant lands, infilling and redevelopment inside the City of Ottawa).

For the reasons advanced in the report dated 26 Jun 84 the planning staff remain convinced that regardless of the amount of development which may potentially be absorbed inside the City of Ottawa, the urban lands designated in the 1974 Plan will need to be available before the end of the planning period.

However it is suggested that as part of the Official Plan Review examine further the feasibility and desirability of pursuing the growth strategy suggested by the City of Ottawa namely of adding 30-40,000 units within the City of Ottawa.

During the summer at the request of the staff of the City of Ottawa Regional staff developed a land use distribution for transportation analysis similar to that advanced by the City of

Ottawa. Although the detailing of the allocation of dwelling units to neighbourhoods has been provided by Regional staff, neither the City of Ottawa nor the community groups have commented on it directly. It is imperative that this allocation be confirmed (or an alternative one arrived at) by December 1984 if a further examination of the City of Ottawa's position is to be made. Therefore it is recommended that:

> **The City of Ottawa be requested to confirm the Regional staff's allocation of 34,000 dwelling units or to recommend an alternate allocation consistent with their brief, by the end of December 1984.**

On this basis, staff accept (with a minor modification) the reworded version of this recommendation as advanced by the City of Ottawa in their brief:

> **The Regional Development Strategy be on the basis of policies which ensure growth potential within the Region, is provided for, including the designation of sufficient urban lands, as required, to meet the high growth projection to 2001.**

Recommendation 4

> The Regional Development Strategy be based on the premise that a major growth centre (or centres) will be developed south of the Greenbelt; the future location, configuration, and the timing of its (their) release to be the subject of further study.

The matter of the south urban community has to be considered in relation to the question of the total future development pattern as a whole and not in isolation.

The future development pattern contained in the 1974 plan is for continued development inside the greenbelt and for development of three communities beyond the greenbelt each eventually achieving a population of 75,000 to 100,000 persons.

To date the official plan review has failed to disclose any reasons for departing from this development pattern. In view of the lengthy arbitration of this issue in 1977 and 1979 by the Ontario Municipal Board and the Ontario Cabinet which resulted in a decision by the latter to reconfirm Council's original 1974 designation of urban land, evidence of a most compelling nature would be required to rescind that decision.

While it has frequently been questioned why the same development pattern is appropriate or needed for a population of roughly 250,000 less than was originally supposed, generally it has been entirely overlooked that the projections of the 1974 plan for physical development - the number of households that would be required and the number of jobs and therefore the amounts of commercial, industrial, institutional and other development required for job sites - are being met. As a consequence physical development in the region is proceeding at the rates envisaged in 1974. Only population growth is not.

The points that have been raised in the briefs that deal other than with the question of the need for the full pattern of development adopted in 1974 and its relation to recent growth rates are the following:

1. That more development than is now assumed can be accommodaed inside the greenbelt and particularly in the City of Ottawa.

2. That consideration should be given to the expansion - beyond the geographic area currently planned - of the east urban community.

3. That a formula or "trigger mechanism" is needed to ensure that a start on the south urban community is not made before certain (unspecified) conditions are met.

Dealing with the first, it is clear that there is a considerable advantage in intensifying development inside the greenbelt at least to any level that has been proposed to the Committee in the May or October hearings. However, the difference between what has been suggested to the committee by regional staff and by the City of Ottawa is some 18,000 units. This is a three to four year building program at current and projected rates and not very material in the long run. The real question, the answer to which affects how much land will be required, is how much low and medium density residential development is needed or desired.

The nub of the matter is the judgement that has to be made about the future housing mix which will be demanded by the residents of the region. It is anticipated, based on the high projection, that approximately 91,000 housing units will be required in the urban area to 2001. Based on past building records, tempered by a judgement about the number of apartments likely to be built the following mix is judged realistic.

	%
Singles	21
Semis	9
Rows	32
Apartments	38
	100

The following table shows the increase in dwelling units by type, by urban, urbanizing and rural parts of RMOC from the Censi of 1971 and 1981.

	Urban[1]	Urbanizing[2]	Rural[3]
Detached	1,950	9,265	3,865
Attached	3,925	14,300	120
Apartment	24,095	5,430	105
Mobile	10	125	275

[1]Ottawa, Rockcliffe Park, Vanier
[2]Nepean, Gloucester, Kanata, Cumberland
[3]Goulbourn, Osgoode, Rideau, West Carleton

It clearly shows the overwhelming preponderance of apartments constructed in the urban area as defined above during the period. This trend is continuing as the latest information from CMHC on dwelling units under construction Aug 84 shows:

	Single	Two Family	Row	Apartment
Urban	85	54	207	1,821
Urbanizing	1,240	42	724	682
Rural[1]	336	-	8	-

[1]Excludes West Carleton
*For singles, semis and rows, an average of the past IV years building record was used. For apartments, the past 20 years record was used excluding the period 1972-75 which saw extraordinary apartment building activity (it is our judgement that we should not plan on the basis of this level of apartment construction occurring again).

Given the existing land situation and planning approvals that have been made it is clear that an undue emphasis on development in Ottawa and Vanier will limit the type of unit available. The Region's Official Plan is based on the view that a choice of lifestyles and living environments should be provided. The staff judge maintenance of choice is important and that given the choice people in the future will choose housing types in a similar proportion to the choice they made in the past. No one has provided a convincing argument to the contrary.

Further more an analysis of the demographics shows that compared to 1981, of the 99,000 additional households in 2001 in the Region 62,000 will be in the age groups 35-54. These are considered the years when there is a high requirement for family type accommodation.

Dealing with the second point, the expansion of the east urban community to a population level greater than that now provided for would require additional transportation facilities over and above those being contemplated in the "Transportation Component of the Official Plan Review" or a level of employment substantially above that now contemplated by the existing official plan. The feasibility and desirability of this suggestion will be examined in stage 2 of the Official Plan Review.

Finally the triggering mechanism is in theory a sound suggestion. However it may be difficult in practice to devise an acceptable "trigger" which takes all interests into account eg. makes sure adequate land, in various ownerships is available at all times, - what is "adequate", how many ownerships, how many locations. However Regional Staff will investigate possible "triggering" formulas in stage 2 of the Official Plan Review.

Regional staff are firmly convinced that the land allocated for urban development in the regional plan will be required and the matter of three urban areas beyond the greenbelt of roughly equal size will be of benefit to the regional community in the long term.

However in view of the concerns expressed at the hearings staff are recommending a change to this recommendation as follows:

> **The Regional Development Strategy be on the basis of complete development inside the Greenbelt and three urban communities of approximately equal size east west and south outside the Greenbelt; the future location, configuration and timing of urban lands additional to those now designated as Phase 1 lands outside the Greenbelt to be the subject of a further study.**

Recommendation 5

> **The Regional Development Strategy be based in general on achieving, or surpassing, the modal split guidelines contained in the 1974 Regional Plan.**

This recommendation received a large measure of support from area municipalities and community groups although several briefs were received in opposition. The opposition comes from two basic concerns.

In the first instance there was concern that too much emphasis may be placed on transit at the expense of needed road improvements - to the detriment of car users. Flowing from this was a questioning of underlying benefit/cost relationships of transit operations and a challenge to prove that across-the-board attempts to improve ridership were in fact cost effective.

In the second instance there was a concern about the impact of current (and future) bus operations on local neighbourhoods (noise, vibration, road failure) and suggestions that the current service standards for transit were, at least in some instances, too high (eg. maximum distance to transit stop too short, bus frequency too high).

Although the staff are sympathetic to the arguments put forward there appears to be clear evidence that the priority given to transit improvements during the life of the existing Regional Plan has been effective in attracting ridership - which in turn has reduced requirements for additional road facilities. Further, there appears to be continuing broad support for further transit improvements. Accordingly, the staff are confirming their support for Recommendation 5 as presented above.

Recommendation 6

> **The Regional Development Strategy be based on shifting the emphasis of employment growth away from the Central Area to other employment centres - with special emphasis on selected nodes along the transitway and the urban communities outside the Greenbelt.**

The basic thrust of this recommendation - to shift the emphasis of employment growth away from the Central Area - received a strong measure of support. The benefits of achieving a good measure of decentralization (reducing work trip length and reduced traffic growth on core area roads) appear to be the basis of this support. There was however an appreciation for the potential difficulties (feasibility) of achieving this and concern expressed that area municipalities and community groups be involved in decisions as to the location of future employment "nodes".

The staff are of the opinion that since the benefits are clear and well appreciated, the strategy should incorporate the basic principle of employment decentralization. Further since the locational aspects may prove critical to the strategy and may involve inter-municipal co-operation, it is appropppriate that the Region remain involved, through its Plan, in locational decisions involving major employment centres.

Accordingly, the staff are confirming their support for Recommendation 6 as presented above.

Recommendation 7

> **Decisions on the Regional Development Strategy not be held in abeyance pending a review of the necessity or timing of individual infrastructure elements, but that these be reviewed in detail in the second stage of the official plan review.**

Perhaps of all recommendations, this one received the most response - both directly and indirectly.

There was a general concern expressed that decisions should not be made on a strategy until the infrastructure requirements, costing and impacts were known and the view was expressed that these details have not been provided. Staff cannot agree with this position to the extent that the costs of hard services under Regional jurisdiction (roads, transitways, sewage and water systems) have been detailed in previous reports (March discussion paper at Appendix 3 and pages 21 to 24; and June Planning Committee report at Annex 1). What has not been detailed is "full costs" with respect to operating costs of Regional services and the costs of non-Regional infrastructure (e.g. local sewers, schools, parks etc). With regard to the latter, staff did contact school boards, area municipalities, and utilities with a view to collecting additional cost figures but were unsuccessful in obtaining many answers.

The basic point made by the staff in the 26 June 84 report was that a majority of the infrastructure items are required regardless of the option chosen and that the first stage of the Official Plan Review should not be used to resolve specific issues related to individual roadways or other infrastructure items.

Against this view were a number of briefs asking that attention be paid to specific infrastructure elements and that decisions on these be reached in this first stage.

The staff do not agree. If Planning Committee were to begin making decisions now (such as the deletion of a particular road links) the result would be a lengthy list of ad hoc decisions. The following is a list of specific infrastructure items that were mentioned in the briefs:

Britannia Arterial
Vanier Parkway Extension
Alta Vista Parkway
S.E. Transitway Corridor
Queensway Collector/Distributor
Watts Creek Sewage Treatment Plant
Fisher Avenue Widening
Chaudière Bridge/Preston link
Portage Bridge/Bronson link
Inner Ring Road
416
Hunt Club Extension
Merivale Corridor

It is the staff's view that proper decisions can be made on the other recommendations contained in this report without concluding on the specific elements listed above. Each of the above will be dealt with in a systematic fashion, in stage two of the Official Plan Review.

On this basis the staff maintain their support for recommendation 7 as written.

Recommendation 8

> **The Regional Development Strategy be based on an urban settlement pattern that recognizes the need for continued growth outside the Greenbelt, directs some of that growth south of the Greenbelt to balance transportation flows around the periphery of the Greenbelt, and encourages future employment growth to occur outside the central area.**

This recommendation was originally formulated to provide a synopsis of the previous seven recommendations - which dealt largely with the urban settlement and employment pattern.

As presented earlier in this report there was considerable concern expressed with several of the component parts and as such this recommendation received little support.

Staff therefore recommend that recommendation 8 should be withdrawn.

Recommendation 9

> **The Regional Development Strategy be based on the continued protection of agricultural, mineral and environmental resources and that the preparation of rural development policies during the second stage of the official plan review, recognize the primary importance of these resources.**

Very few of the briefs commented on this recommendation - but those that did voiced support. Notwithstanding this, however, the opinion was expressed that the past record of protecting agricultural lands was not as good as it should have been and that Council should strive to achieve an "increased" rather than a continued level of support for agricultural lands.

Staff are of the opinion that the recommendation given above does not require amendment but that a full discussion of agricultural protection be brought forward after the current study of agricultural lands and policies is concluded (part of the Official Plan Review).

Recommendation 10

> **The Regional Development Strategy be based on the recognition that serviced villages in close proximity to the urban area are a Regional concern and that these communities be subject to the urban development policies of the Regional Plan.**

As with the previous recommendation, very few briefs touched upon this matter - but those that did voiced support. The arguments leading to this recommendation are set forth in the 26 June 84 report to Planning Committee as follows:

> Although the planning for villages is still judged to be largely a local matter it is the staff's view that the extension of piped services to a village on the boundary of the urban area is of regional concern and that this signals the ultimate conversion of the village from a rural community to one of a principally urban character.

> The regional concerns relate to the orderly and efficient provision of piped services and the possible impact these mini-urban centres may have on the development of other urban areas within the region. It is therefore appropriate that the decision to service such areas be a matter for Regional Council to address through its plan, and once recognized as a serviced village, these communities should be subject to the same Regional Plan policies that guide urban growth.

The staff continue to support Recommendation 10 as written.

Recommendation 11

> The Regional Development Strategy be based on the principle that overall growth in the rural areas of the region will not exceed ten percent of total regional growth.

Very few briefs addressed this recommendation and of those that did, some were in support, some were not. The basic argument set out in the 26 June 84 staff report was that several basic objectives regarding the rural area (protection of resources, and provision of an "alternate lifestyle") could be frustrated if growth in the rural area was excessive. Further, the basic objective of directing urban growth to a few locations where full services could be economically provided might be frustrated by scattered growth in the rural area. In essence, very little of the growth in the rural area is truly "rural growth" i.e. based on agriculture, minerals, etc. but rather is "regional" residential growth which may opt to locate in the rural area.

Planning for growth in the rural area in relation to overall regional growth is therefore still strongly supported by staff.

However, it is not clear that 10% is the correct figure at which to control this growth. If, as suggested in Recommendation 10 above, serviced villages become, in effect, part of the "urban area", then the 10% limit may no longer accurately reflect the historical relationship of growth in the rural and urban parts of the Region. It is the staff's position that the question of an appropriate level of growth needs further examination, but that the principle of planning rural growth in relation to total regional growth be maintained. Accordingly, the staff are recommending a modification to Recommendation 11 as follows:

> **The Regional Development Strategy be based on the principle that the amount of growth in the rural areas of the region be planned to occur in relation to overall growth in the Region.**

Additional Recommendations

In addition to the eleven recommendations discussed above, there were numerous other recommendations or suggestions put forward in the briefs. A major issue relates to the future steps in the Official Plan Review process. This is discussed below.

Of the remainder, a number of recommendations dealt with what may be considered "second stage" policy concerns (parking policies, individual road facilities, protection of land

parcels for low income housing, design and impact of transit stations, user-pay, rural population allocations, studies of marginal lands etc.). Staff recommend that all such details be carried forward into the second stage and no decisions be taken on these at this time.

Other suggestions related more to the way planning is done in RMOC. The need for a more co-operative planning exercise (RMOC, area municipalities, CRO, NCC etc.) was voiced in several briefs. It is evident that the degree of consultation between the staffs of agencies affecting (and affected by) planning in RMOC has not been made particularly evident to the public during the consultation process.

But going beyond the question of staff consultation, there appears to be something much larger emerging from the briefs - the concept of a single planning exercise (perhaps a single plan) that would ensure compatible plans and produce a clear picture of the region's future. While staff are sympathetic to this concern, it is something beyond their ability to redress as part of the job they have been given to do (an RMOC Official Plan Review).

And finally, there were also suggestions in the briefs of areas where information appeared to be incomplete - such as growth trends in the Outaouais; goals analysis, social and economic trends etc. These could be topics of future discussion between the staff and interested members of the regional community based on information staff has at hand.

Process

Staff are very pleased with what has been achieved to date and the degree to which major issues are beginning to clarify. The Planning Committee has consistantly asked that the Official Plan Review be completed in this term of Council. It is by no means certain that this can be accomplished, since it is staff's judgement that a considerable amount of time is required for the public to understand, discuss and respond to planning issues. Staff have always advised that more time should be provided public consultation in Stage 2 of the official plan review than in Stage 1. Eight months have been provided in Stage 1 and not all issues have been resolved satisfacatorily. However it is also staff's experience that the members of the public require a document to help them organize their thoughts around. With this in mind staff propose the following:

14 Nov 84 - Confirmation of this report by Regional Council.

May 1985 - Tabling of draft official plan and supporting documentation for discussion.

September 1985 - Submission of briefs on draft official plan.

January 1986 - Final Draft Official Plan

Spring 1986 - Public Hearing/Council consideration.

In order for editing, drafting, translation and printing to take place for release in May, the text will have to be available in early March. Thus a first draft must be available internally in January 84. It can be appreciated that this time schedule is very tight.

There is a further complication. The Transportation Planning Division, due to pressure of other work will be unable to complete all work required for a draft chapter on transportation and the accompanying schedules until September 1985 at the earliest. Some work will be done by May, but the complete documentation is not likely to be available till later. It is hoped that the transportation chapter will "catch up" to the rest of the document in fall 1985.

In addition Council are advised that if the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing continues in his intent to make Section 40 of The Planning Act effective on 1 Aug 85 it will be necessary for Council to adopt an official plan amendment identifying the specific widths of roads if it wishes to continue to take road widenings under Section 40 (site plan control). This will have to be before 1 Aug 85 and therefore will not fit neatly into the process outlined above.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing discussion, it is the staff's view that considerable progress has been made to date in clarifying several major issues relating to a regional development strategy, and that this progress should be formalized through Council taking decisions on the recommendations set forth in this report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary, the staff recommendations are as follows:

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

1. **The Regional Development Strategy be on the basis that Ottawa-Carleton could grow to between 625,000 and 725,000 persons by the turn of this century with the expectation of additional growth beyond 2001 and that infrastructure be provided incrementally dependent upon the actual amount of growth which materializes through the planning period.**

2. **The Regional Development Strategy Development be on the basis that the number of additional housing units required to 2001 will be in the range of 65,000 to 100,000 units, that a mixture of low, medium, and high density housing forms will be provided, and that a variety of housing types both inside and outside the Greenbelt will best accommodate the housing requirements of this century.**

3. **The Regional Development Strategy be based on policies which ensure sufficient growth potential, within the Region, including the designation of sufficient urban lands, as required, to meet the high growth projection to 2001.**

4. **The Regional Development Strategy be on the basis of complete development inside the greenbelt and three urban communities of approximately equal size, east, west and south outside the greenbelt; the future location, configuration and timing of urban lands additional to those now designated as Phase 1 lands outside the greenbelt to be the subject of a further study.**

5. The Regional Development Strategy be based in general on achieving, or surpassing, the modal split guidelines contained in the 1974 Regional Plan.

6. The Regional Development Strategy be based on shifting the emphasis of employment growth away from the Central Area to other employment centres - with special emphasis on selected nodes along the transitway and the urban communities outside the Greenbelt.

7. Decisions on the Regional Development Strategy not be held in abeyance pending a review of the necessity or timing of individual infrastructure elements, but that these be reviewed in detail in the second stage of the official plan review.

8. Staff recommend that recommendation 8 be withdrawn.

9. The Regional Development Strategy be based on the continued protection of agricultural, mineral and environmental resources and that the preparation of rural development policies during a subsequent phase of the official plan review, recognize the primary importance of these resources.

10. The Regional Development Strategy be based on the recognition that serviced villages in close proximity to the urban area are a Regional concern and that these communities be subject to the urban development policies of the Regional Plan.

11. The Regional Development Strategy be based on the principle that the amount of growth in the rural areas of the region be planned to occur in relation to overall growth in the Region.

PROCESS

12. The process outlined on P. 12 be confirmed which would result in draft official plan for discussion (excluding the transportation chapter) being available in May 1985.

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

13. The staff as part of Stage 2 of the Official Plan Review investigate the desirability and feasibility of a) increased growth inside the greenbelt as contemplated by the City of Ottawa and b) increasing the size of the East Urban Community as contemplated by the Township of Cumberland.

14. In order that 13a) can be carried out the City of Ottawa be requested to confirm the Regional staff's allocation of 34,000 dwelling units or to recommend an alternate allocation consistant with their brief, by the end of December 1984.

J.M. Wright
Planning Commissioner